INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION

**TELECOMMUNICATION
STANDARDIZATION SECTOR**

STUDY PERIOD 2005-2008

COM 15 – LS 222 – E

English only

Original: English

Question(s):	14/15

Source:	ITU-T SG 15
Title:	GMPLS Signaling on VCAT/LCAS

LIAISON STATEMENT

To:	IETF CCAMP WG
Approval:	ITU-T SG15 (Geneva, 11-22 February 2008)
For:	Action
Deadline:	15 September 2008

Contact:	Hing-Kam Lam Alcatel-Lucent USA	Tel: +1 908 582 0672 Fax: +1 908 582 5171 Email: hklam@alcatel-lucent.com

Q14/15 thanks you for your liaison of 1st February 2008
(https://datatracker.ietf.org/public/liaison_detail.cgi?detail_id=415, which is TD515 (WP3/15)).

Here are our comments to the responses provided in your liaison:

a) Regarding your response to Question 1 on protocol extensibility to encompass technologies other than SONET/SDH, we notice that the recent I-D (draft-ietf-ccamp-gmpls-vcat-lcas-04.txt) limits the number of VCGs per call to one. We support this position and consider this to be a VCAT call.

b) Regarding your response to Question 4 on multiple calls support, VCAT is viewed as a layer of its own and has its own call controller. As per the interlayer architecture in G.8080 section 6.6, the VCAT call would be associated with a server layer call or calls, each of which would have/own one or more server layer connections. It is these connections that are part of the VCG. In retrospect, a single call is sufficient for diverse routing as it can hold details of both connections so that they don't use the same resources.

An example where multiple server calls associated with one VCAT call would be useful is when all VCAT connections are to be protected. Here, rather than one call maintain the knowledge of all working/protection pairs, it is simpler to have multiple calls each of which only maintains one working/protection pair. This is even more convenient when restoration behavior is applied when the protection connection fails.

c) Regarding your response to Question 6 on IP address format in GMPLS, we suggest the I-D clarifies that there are different name (or identifier) spaces even though they may all use the same IP address format, e.g.

- Control component

  The identifiers used to identify the entities that perform the control plane functions, such as route computation, signaling, control plane message delivering, etc.

- Transport resource

  The identifiers used to identify transport resource when they are referred to in the control plane messages. Note that these identifiers may not be the same as those referred to in the management plane messages.

- SCN

  The addresses used to deliver control plane messages

Examples of a similar address format in use in two different name spaces can be seen in the OSPF routing protocol, where router ID (control and transport link scope) and IP address (used by the forwarder) do not have to be the same.

Regarding your liaison response on GMPLS Calls (https://datatracker.ietf.org/public/liaison_detail.cgi?detail_id=414, which is TD516 (WP3/15)), thank you for your response. We do not have any further reply at this time and appreciate the invitation for future input to CCAMP.

An electronic copy of this liaison statement is available at:
ftp://ftp.itu.int/tsg15opticaltransport/COMMUNICATIONS/index.html

_____